

## REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that Claims 2-6 and 8 contain allowable subject matter, and would be allowed if amended into independent form. Applicants have opted not to amend the claims in this manner at this time because, for the reasons discussed below, Applicants believe that independent Claim 1 is allowable in its current form.

Claims 1 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 5,054,199 to Ogawa et al. Applicants respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Ogawa et al. reference fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of the present invention. More specifically, the Ogawa et al. reference fails to disclose or suggest a trimmer attachment for a hair clipper that includes, *inter alia*, “a movable trimmer blade that reciprocates in response to reciprocation of the reciprocating blade of the hair clipper” (emphasis added), as defined in independent Claim 1.

In the device defined in Claim 1 of the present application, the reciprocating blade 130 of the attachment 10 reciprocates in response to reciprocation of the reciprocating blade 18 of the hair trimmer. In other words, the reciprocating blade 18 of the trimmer drives the reciprocating blade 130 of the attachment.

In contrast, in the device of Ogawa et al., both of the reciprocating blades (52 and 72) are directly driven by different portions of drive element 30. Reciprocating blade 72



is not driven by reciprocating blade 52, and therefore it cannot be considered that blade 72 reciprocates “in response to reciprocation” of blade 52.

The Examiner has argued that if reciprocating blade 52 is stopped, then reciprocating blade 72 will also stop reciprocating, and therefore blade 72 can be considered as reciprocating in response to blade 52. Assuming *arguendo* that this is true (i.e., that eccentric shaft 31 will not simply rotate within a broken vertical slot 57), then blade 72 only *stops* reciprocating in response to blade 52 being *stopped* from reciprocating. This does not satisfy the language of Claim 1 that defines a movable trimmer blade “that reciprocates in response to reciprocation of the reciprocating blade of the hair clipper,” which is essentially the opposite of the scenario that the Examiner described. In other words, causing a part to stop reciprocating is not the same as causing a part to reciprocate.

Additionally, it cannot be argued that blade 72 reciprocates in response to reciprocation of blade 52 because the reciprocation of blade 52 does not cause any movement of blade 72. Instead, blade 72 reciprocates in response to the rotation of eccentric cam 32, which reciprocates center member 41, which moves rocker 82. Accordingly, for these reasons, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this §103 rejection of independent Claim 1 and associated dependent Claim 7.

As an additional issue, Applicants do not understand why this rejection is a §103 rejection (and not a §102 rejection) because the Examiner did not specify any modifications being made to the device of Ogawa et al. If this rejection is maintained, clarification on this point is respectfully requested.




Applicants have also added new Claims 9-20, and respectfully submit that these new claims are also allowable. More specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that new independent Claim 9, and associated dependent Claims 10-14 are allowable because the cited references fail to disclose or suggest a trimmer attachment that includes, *inter alia*, “means for removably securing the attachment to the hair clipper” (emphasis added), as defined in independent Claim 9. Additionally, with regard to independent Claim 15, and associated dependent Claims 16-20, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest a trimmer attachment that includes, “a movable trimmer blade that is driven, in a reciprocating manner, by reciprocation of the reciprocating blade of the hair trimmer.”

For all of the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would aid in the prosecution of the application, or that outstanding issues exist, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



James K. Folker

Registration No. 37,538

December 4, 2003  
Suite 2500  
300 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 360-0080  
Customer No. 24978

K:\2206\65752\amd-d.doc